

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed July 6, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claims 4-7 and 9-14 are objected to. Claims 15-20 are allowed. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claims 2, 4 and 9 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully submit the following for consideration.

Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,957,199 to Fisher. Claims 4-7 and 9-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 2 and 4. Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 9.

Claim 1, as amended recites "receiving a call to open the window; determining a security level associated with the window; wherein the security level is selected from at least one non-trusted security level and at least one trusted security level; when the security level indicates that content within the window comes from a non-trusted source displaying the window with a security element that a user may view to determine that the content within the window comes from the non-trusted source; examining attributes associated with the call to open the window; adjusting at least one of the attributes within the call such that the security element is displayed for the non-trusted security element; and sending the modified call to open the window." Claim


1 is proposed to be allowable since it includes the limitations of Claims 2 and 4. The claims depending on Claim 1 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Claim 8, as amended recites in part “determining a security level associated with the window; and when the security level indicates that content within the window comes from the non-trusted source adjusting the at least one located parameter.” Claim 8 is proposed to be allowable since it includes the limitations of Claim 9. The claims depending on Claim 8 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

